

While Prices Soar Governments Appeal to the Capitalists

When the Janata Party took up power at the Centre one of its pledges to the people was to take such economic measures as would ensure economic stability and bring down prices. Similar assurances were made to the people of West Bengal by the CPI(M) led Government before assuming power. But what has been the experience of the people? Far from decline, prices of all commodities have climbed up to new heights.

In fact the situation has become quite alarming; there is a galloping price increase and the miseries of the toiling people are becoming even more unbearable. According to the Economic Times the retail price index for the months of April-July '77 alone registered an increase of 11.4 per cent as compared to 1.2 per cent for the corresponding period of last year, whereas prices of food articles which were already soaring have further risen by as much as 12.6 per cent since July '76. For example, pulses, a poor man's substitute for fish and milk products alone have increased by 42.7 per cent, followed by oil and fats with 42.5 per cent, and vegetables and fruits by 25.2 per cent, since July '76 not to speak of the increase in other commodities, excepting food.

Thus, for the majority of the people in our country whose wages are already below subsistence level malnutrition and starvation loom larger than ever before because of this further galloping price rise. While the sufferings of the working class and employees are becoming most since they do not get proper compensation for this price rise in their wages.

What has caused this price increase? The West Bengal CPI(M) led Government has put the blame on the Centre and the Prime Minister Moraji Desai in his speech on Independence Day blamed "the economic situation which the government had inherited. The Prime Minister appealed to the people to understand that it was not possible to show quick results on the price front because the situation had been created over the past few years". But he gave

an assurance that "the policy now being adopted by the Government would soon start producing results, ushering in an era of stability on the price front", adding "the prerequisite to a regime of price stability was increased production". What ever may be the explanations and the almost ritualistic assurances the real cause behind this economic malady lies in the capitalist economic system itself, which is governed by the law of earning maximum profit. In the present third phase of world capitalist crisis stagflation has become an international phenomenon, especially in the under developed countries, where the feature of stagnation in economy coupled with inflation is felt most. As the international capitalist market has become more and more contracted due to the emergence of socialist countries and the newly resurgent countries competition has become more and more stiff, in the world capitalist market which too has become more and more squeezed. Lack of market both nationally and internationally leads to stagnation in economy; the commodities produced cannot be sold and they accumulate. Since the motive force of production in capitalism is to earn maximum profit, in this situation the capitalists, in order to keep up their profit, produce less but add higher profit margin to make up for the decrease in quantity, which leads to higher prices. This is a concomitant evil of capitalism. No big talk, no good will of the government can reverse this trend; nothing short of the overthrow of the capitalist system through socialist revolution and establishment of socialist

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Founder Editor-in-Chief—COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

VOL. 11

1st SEPTEMBER '77

PRICE 30 P.

No. 2

THURSDAY

Air Surcharge 4 P.

COMRADE PRITISH CHANDA'S STATEMENT ON BONUS POLICY

Comrade Pritish Chanda, General Secretary, UTUC (Lenin Sarani) has issued the following statement to the press on the recent declaration of Bonus policy by the Central Government:

Bonus is a most legitimate right of the workers and employees. To pay bonus to all employees both in private and government concerns, abolition of its upper ceiling, declaring bonus as 'deferred wage', and above all, to make payment of bonus compulsory in all concerns irrespective of making profit or otherwise is a

long standing legitimate demand of the working people in our country. We, on behalf of our organisation, have always insisted that the government should meet this legitimate demand.

But the Bonus policy as has been declared by the Janata Government falls far short of this demand. Government concerns including the railways, post and telegraph etc. have been kept out of the purview of bonus. Bonus has not been recognised as 'deferred wage'. Upper ceiling for bonus has been set.

Above all, the provision

for exemption from payment of bonus given to 'sick industries' will open up the scope for non-payment of bonus on the plea of 'sick industry'.

So, although the government has declared the policy of paying bonus 8.33 per cent at the minimum the workers' demand for bonus in its entirety remains unfulfilled.

This again proves that in a capitalist society like ours the working people have no other recourse than mass struggle even for the fulfilment of most legitimate democratic demands.

system of production can solve this crisis. But that doesn't mean a bourgeois government has no responsibility. It is a basic duty of any democratic government to ensure that people are supplied at least with the essential commodities at a standard price within their reach. Yet the people in our country are left completely at the mercy of hoarders, black-marketeers and profiteers. Just to appeal to the goodwill of these hoarders or just empty talk will not help in any way. What is needed is the introduction of complete government control, that is all-out State Trading, including the retail stage, in foodgrains and essential commodities, establishing a widespread efficient distribution system so as to

ensure its success. This is the only way by which the government can curb the nefarious activities of these hoarders and blackmarketeers. There is no other solution; anything short of all out State Trading will be ineffective as past experiences have already shown. With government taking over of wholesale trading in food-grain the wholesale traders turned overnight into retail traders. This is the warning that has been given all along by our party.

In West Bengal the CPI(M) led 'left' government did not also lag behind in giving promise to the people in the election of ensuring price stability and even a price decrease. But in reality there is further galloping

price rise while the profits of the monopolists and big business houses are rising, too. Yet the government has not taken any measures to alleviate the sufferings of the people. It is washing its hand just pointing to the centre. Though there is a necessity of taking some measures on a national level; the state has also the responsibility and it is within its power to take some measures which can bring a modicum of relief to the people, but instead of doing this the CPI(M) led government is also appealing to the good senses of the hoarders and blackmarketeers as well as the capitalists in the same manner as the Janata Government is doing at the centre. In this aspect there is no difference (Contd. to Page 8)

WHERE LIES THE REAL DIFFERENCE ?

In reply to CPI(M)'s canard

Before the last Assembly election in West Bengal, the CPI (M) leaders like Sri Promode Dasgupta and Joyti Basu, while repeatedly assuring the industrialists and business houses, were telling that *"the left Front would not encourage 'gheraos'". The government would intervene if anyone was gheraoed.* He (Sri Basu) said workers had the right to strike and organise Bandhs but *these should not be resorted to too often."*

—(Statesman reporting Sri Jyoti Basu's speech 21. 5. 77.—Italics ours)

Sri Dasgupta said in a press conference, "We have never taken any programme of 'gherao'. Nor it is a bold form of movement"—(Ganasakti 11, 4, 77.)

Sri Dasgupta is also on record pointing out our Party SUCI 'being responsible' for the 'introduction of gherao' during the UF Governments in the past and that it was our party that encouraged it. 'Jugantar' a bourgeois daily wrote an editorial comment on this statement of Sri Dasgupta, on the eve of the Assembly election.

Had the CPI (M) leadership stopped at this disowning of their responsibility for militant form of working class movement or the assurance that they would not encourage such form of struggle in future then we would have nothing to say particularly about it because that is a matter for the supporters, the rank and file of that party and of the trade unions of their control to take and decide as to how can a party be trustworthy both to the capitalists and the working class at the same time. But they have not stopped there.

By way of an explanation to the various questions that are being raised from the rank and file and the left-oriented masses as to why they are taking particular care to keep distance and a policy of disunity with our party and mass fronts, as also to carry favour with the industrial and business houses, the CPI(M) leadership has, for sometime past, been resorting to and harping on a particular line of propaganda against our party.

Sri Jyoti Basu, in a Press Conference in New Delhi on July 10, when he went to meet the Prime Minister after becoming the Chief Minister of the State, said that he was "certain" about the stability of the 'Left Front' Government because "in

the former United Front, there were sections coming out of the Congress and others who resorted to 'disruptive activities'. At the sametime he held that "something can be done because the Janata Government is in Delhi. We think it is a friendly government".

(Statesman 11th July '77.)

"In an interview, Mr. Promode Dasgupta said he did not visualise any difficulties for Left Front unity unlike the United Front in 1967 and 1969.....In the United Front, there had been elements like Ajoy Mukherjee and other divisive forces represented by CPI and the Socialist Unity Centre".

(Statesman—July 7, 77).

Both Sri Dasgupta and Sri Basu spared no pains to declare that there was 'difference' between the present 'Left Front' Government and the earlier UF Governments.

In their mouthpiece 'People's Democracy', they said. "The disruptive role of the SUC" has been "rejected by the people".

(Peoples Democracy, July 3, 77)

Similar specimens are coming out on and often from these CPI(M) leaders. Neither Sri Dasgupta nor Sri Basu however did care to explain the specific instances of the so-called disruption that our party is said to have caused although the charge of

disruption against our party is so much on their lips. As we will see, this is nothing new as a tactics in the working class movement and those who resort to it have hardly shown the political moral guts to specify the charges by concretely citing the instances, the issues involved, the exact line of difference, its real political content etc. in order to educate the class and the masses which is essential to bring clarity in political movement.

However, they may not feel the necessity or may shy away to spell the truth, the whole truth, but we certainly can not leave the matter there. Because, experience from history, particularly the history of fascist movement, shows that it is not an entirely unknown phenomenon that oft-repeated untruth takes the semblance of truth and deceives the masses. Hitler's rise in Germany, had behind it such systematic practice of untruth. Besides, a party that really stands on the moral ethical concepts of Marxism-Leninism should never hide anything about its political role and conduct as it has nothing to fear about to the people.

Before entering into various aspects of the CPI(M) propaganda and false accusations against our Party, they may be summarised. They say that (1) there is 'difference' between the present 'left front' and its government and the UF and its governments because of the absence of 'reactionary' Ajoy Mukherjee, opportunist CPI and 'disruptor' SUCI. They are therefore 'certain about its stability because of 'cohesion' and the 'friendly' Janata government at the Centre. (2) it is our Party SUCI that has played a 'disruptive role' in the united left movement and for this (3) it has been 'rejected by the people' at the Assembly poll, this time.

What is the Marxist approach to bourgeois election

Let us take the last point first. The question of 'success' or otherwise in a bourgeois election is judged differently by different parties according to their respective class character, outlook and approaches. **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, the great leader of the proletariat, the founder General Secretary of our Party, has taught and trained our Party with the revolutionary teaching that the basic difference in the class character of the parties contesting an election in a bourgeois system must get its reflection in the very attitude, approach, style and mode of conduction of the election battle. The sole aim of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois social democratic parties is "to grab as many seats as possible in the election, by any means and thus capture governmental power". And by thus coming to power, they "aim at and strive to retain the bourgeois class rule, this very existing system through some nominal reforms under cover of high sounding slogans". The so-called logic of these social-democratic parties runs like this: Whatever is necessary to defeat the enemy should be done. And "on the plea of fighting, donning the mask of revolutionary, they too are adopting the same trick, same tactics, the same means that the bourgeoisie do, the only difference being that these parties do so....in the name of revolutionary politics...."

"But when the proletariat, from revolutionary objective, are left with no other alternative than to participate in the election battle to be with the masses, they do so on the basis of a definite revolutionary base political line of the proletariat. They also try utmost to win as many seats as possible. But never the focal point of their objective can be anyhow to grab maximum seats. Their focal point is to educate the people to fight

an election battle on the basis of a mass revolutionary line, and following that, if they can win maximum seats so much the better....If not a single seat no matter.....But the central focal point can never be to anyhow grab some seats."

(Speech at the Delegate Session of Durgapur Steel Workers' Co-ordination Committee, 18th March 1974.)

Our Party, guided by this basic revolutionary outlook and approach of our great teacher, and guide **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** fought the election to uphold the base political line of the proletariat which is anti-capitalist Socialist Revolution in our country. It did never hold out any false hope and promise to the people or sops of social reforms like easing the problems of moribund capitalism within the system itself. Nor did it woo and beg the support of the bourgeoisie, the monopoly press, money bags, bureaucracy, rural vested interest by repeated assurances of fidelity to bourgeois legality, of arresting the militant movement of the people within the narrow bounds of bourgeois parliamentarism, legalism - reformism, of 'serving' all sections of the people at the sometime, so on and so forth as did the petty bourgeois reformist parties. It on the other hand, went deeper down with the masses, with unflagging devotion, sincerity of purpose and a high ethical moral tone of the selfless workers to carry the revolutionary message of fighting the election on the base political line of the proletariat. To be politically conscious about the 'two party' system, the new device of fascism, to be alert about the treachery of Social Democracy, to organise themselves politically organisationally in the concrete shape of their own instruments of struggle were the revolutionary tasks that our Party placed before the masses through the conduction of electoral

(Contd. to Page 3)

Bourgeoisie Beget, Foster and Secure for Itself

(Contd. from Page 2)
battle. For, this is the only course following which the people can advance their struggle for emancipation from capitalist yoke to achieve real socialism.

Social Democracy—the last prop of Social Support of the bourgeoisie

In vain, therefore, CPI(M) leadership tries to denigrate our principled stand and singlehanded heroic battle in the election against all the forces of *status quo* including the compromising forces of social-democracy. For us, the yard stick of success or a political battle, be it election or any other movement, is something completely different, may be, incomprehensible to those who have long renounced Marxism-Leninism but use it as a mere cover. But before gloating over 'success' and denigrating others over electoral results in a bourgeois democracy, any Marxist-Leninist worth the salt must measure up their 'success' or otherwise with the historic development that Lenin pointed out long ago: "In all countries the bourgeoisie has already begotten, fostered and secured for itself bourgeois labour parties of social chauvinists.... The important thing is that economically the desertion of a stratum of the labour aristocracy to the bourgeoisie has matured and become an accomplished fact and this economic fact, this shift in class relations, will find political form, in one shape or another, without any particular 'difficulty'... Lucrative jobs in the government or on the war industries, in parliament and on diverse committees, on the editorial staffs of 'respectable' legally published newspapers or on the management councils of no less respectable and 'bourgeois law-abiding' trade unions—this is the bait by which the imperialist bourgeoisie attracts and rewards the representatives and supporters of the bourgeois labour parties.....The

mechanics of political democracy works in the same direction. Nothing in our times can be done without election, nothing can be done without the masses. And in this era of printing and parliamentarism it is impossible to gain the following of the masses without a widely ramified, systematically managed, well equipped system of flattery, lies, fraud (Lenin did not visualise then the fraud in the very mechanism of election, now being called euphemistically, 'rigging'—writer) juggling with fashionable and popular catch words, and promising all manners of reforms and blessings to the workers right and left—as long as they renounce the revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie." Lenin called this system Lloyd-Georgism after the English Minister because "Lloyd George serves the bour-

election in justification of this kind of 'politiking' which an ordinary man now interprets as nothing but to take a 'fair share' of the election, to induct in that ministry Sri Nripen Chakravorty as leader of the party group, who was 'rejected' by the people at the last parliamentary poll, or say for instance when Sri P. Rammurthy a Polit Bureau member of the party after being 'rejected' by the people at the Parliamentary poll (keeping his deposit money or not is immaterial) gets himself elected to the Rajya Sabha with 22 votes of AIDMK legislators—what are all these?

Do they bear the slightest trace of minimum ethical-moral principles of Marxism-Leninism or prove otherwise that the party has reduced itself to utterly opportunist parliamentary election Party?

Besides, what should

poll—which one is revolutionary Marxism and which a sham Marxism? Judge friend, judge, if you are still left with the power of judgement of a Marxist!

Disruptors have on their lips most the charge of disruption

Now, take their so-called charge of 'disruption' against our party. To repeat the charge of disunity or disruption against some one on and often without caring for specifying concrete instances as also the political issues, if any, involved in the difference, to the masses smacks of a particular variety of political morality and is usually associated with the tactics not of the revolutionary Marxists but of the sham Marxists, the social-democrats. Marx, Engels, Lenin Stalin, Mao Tse-tung all had for them, enough of

pointed our party's stand on this question and its significance to the fate of mass movement. **Comrade Ghosh** said:

—I want to raise another point, in this connection to our people. Our stand as regards united mass movement is being tried to be distorted and misinterpreted. We would therefore like to make our position clear.

We do stand for united mass struggles. But fact is that, those of us, the different political parties who join united mass struggles, have for each, different political line and if these different political lines are not just a formal affair, if we really mean them as our party surely does, then this difference in base political line must have its reflection in the programme of united mass movements. For this, difference in opinions is bound to appear as regards selection of time of movement, its style of conduction, the fundamental goal and objective where we want to reach and for that with what type of political tuning these movements are to be developed. We are definitely opposed to any compromise on the difference that is bound to appear within the united platform of mass movements centering round the base political line and ideological principles. That is why others try to brand us 'anti-unity'.

....Fight against capitalism is a common point no doubt. But is it not also true that according to different political lines of the parties we have our differences on the tactical questions? So, when we join together to build up

Petty-bourgeois Labour Parties

geoisie splendidly and serves it precisely among the workers, brings its influence precisely to the proletariat where the bourgeoisie needs it most and where it finds it most difficult to subject the masses morally."

—(Lenin—Imperialism and the Split in Socialism—Italics ours)

So, to align with the regional bourgeois and even communal parties like AIDMK in Tamilnadu the Akalis in the Punjab, Muslim League in Kerala, even to align with the principal bourgeois alternative Janata Party which represents the same very vested interest as Congress did represent according to the political analysis of the party so much eager for such alignment, to appease that Party at the centre, constantly, by calling it a friendly party just to stay on in the state government for five years, to align with that Party in Tripura coalition Ministry which exists on the extended lease of life given by the hated, 42nd amendment to the constitution, to offer the plea of ensuring fair

be the fundamental objective of a Marxist-Leninist party when it participates in a bourgeois election and even after winning an election forms a government? Is it to serve as a faithful agent of the bourgeois exploitative system, to perpetuate it, to spread illusion about it among the masses by practising bourgeois legalism-reformism? Or to handle the police and the bureaucratic-administrative system so as to remove obstacles as far as possible from the path of mass movement, to rise above the sense of bourgeois legality and use the government as an instrument of mass movements, to encourage and help people's political initiative to crystallise in concrete forms of their instruments of struggle by raising their ideological-political standard? As against their approach, to carry the election battle on the firm basis of a consistent mass revolutionary line, not compromising by an inch, the revolutionary goal and objective of the proletariat for the momentary success at a bourgeois

such experiences in their lifetime. That is why, Engels in his letter to Bebel (June 20, 1873) gave this important warning:

"One must not allow oneself to be misled by the cry for 'unity'. Those who have this word most often on their lips are ones who sow the most dissension.....For this reason, the biggest sectarians and the biggest brawlers and rogues at times shout loudest for unity. Nobody in our lifetime has given us more trouble and been more treacherous than the shouters for unity.

—(Marx-Engels-Selected correspondence — Italics ours)

of Social Chauvinists

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our great departed leader, teacher and guide cautioned us and the people against those who deny the right to criticism and conduction of ideological struggle within the united mass movement and explained the political motive that lay hidden in that trend. He at the same time pin-

a united mass movement on some democratic programme, different trends and tendencies lie hidden within the movement itself for misleading and diverting it from the fundamental goal and objective where we want to lead it. Therefore, if ideological struggle is not conducted then how can

(Contd. to Page 6)

[The Janata Government appointed several committees consisting of representatives from central trade unions to devise ways and means for expansion of market for the steel industry among other things. Comrade Pritish Chanda, General Secretary of UTUC (Lenin Sarani) as a member of the study group on expansion of market of steel industry submitted the following note where he opposed the government's policy of inviting imperialist countries for investment in steel industry on terms harmful to the interest of industrial development of the economy. He also opposed export of scarce mineral resources to those countries. Since, he submitted his note, the bourgeois dailies are bringing out news that go to confirm Comrade Chanda's reading of the mind of the government.

The Economic Times, wrote in an editorial comment on July 20, on 'Indo-Japanese ties' "that Mr. Biju Patnaik, is already vigorously pursuing prospects of Japanese investment on a large scale in a wide range of extractive industries for export in a semi-processed state to Japan and third world countries".

Below, we reproduce the note of Comrade Pritish Chanda.

—Ed. Board, Proletarian Era.]

We are seized with the problem of expansion of steel industry. We all know that steel plays a pivotal role in the country's economy and so, the problem of steel cannot be viewed in isolation of the entire economy, its ills and maladies. Certain pertinent questions, therefore, will come up in our discussion before we can pinpoint the basic problems. But our basic approach must be whether it should be a dynamic one or just a short-cut, a temporary palliative without touching or attempting to cure the basic causes of malady. I mean to say that the proposal mooted by the Ministry have no other object than making it an export-oriented steel production plan. But this has nothing new in it. The country has been hearing for sometime past, export-oriented growth even of agricultural products. The results are well-known and we all have felt.

In the 'Economic Survey' presented this year, before the Central budget, the new government had to admit:

".....lack of adequate internal demand has been one of the factors compelling domestic producers to export".

So, for the same reason, there may be cry today for export-oriented steel production.

Now, the pertinent questions involved are the following:

First, do we like the country to develop industrially and be a self-reliant one in meeting the growing needs of a developing economy by our own production and expertise? If so, then after decades of development and massive public spending at the cost of tremendous sufferings of the people, should we or should we not short out the real causes of sluggish industrial growth and try to tackle them at least in so far as and to the extent

that is possible within the capitalist productive system. From a dynamic view, our approach should be to develop domestic market for internal consumption of steel, particularly when we are among those countries which have the lowest per capita consumption of steel in the world. With such a low level of production, emphasis on export means, we agree to remain backward industrially, economically and mind it, this is a continuing process—retrogression invariably brings further retrogression, backwardness compounds in further backwardness.

Secondly, it is obvious from bare scrutiny of the figures of steel production of over a decade that this vital sector suffers from the constraint of a chronic and continuous recessionary trend in the intermediary and consumer industries which is because of the narrow base of home-market thanks to the

ever-falling purchasing power of the masses. As a result, installed capacity could not be fully harnessed and even when there had been any slight increase because of boostings provided through fiscal concessions of the government, the industry faced the most unenviable situation of 'over production' or crisis of market which is the concomitant evil of the capitalist system. The so-called 'over-production' does not signify the surplus over and above meeting the growing requirements of the society. But as it happens in capitalist economy, this means that the market base has failed to absorb even limited increase in production. Such is the case with our steel industry.

Thirdly, in the context of this basic truth what should be the remedial step that we must think in terms of the country's real progress towards industrial development and self-

tries in various forms of partnership obviously to gain market and in economic terms. The government and the capitalists of the developing countries want to be the junior partners of these developed countries having been content with an outlet of accumulated stock and gaining some sort of markets in future. They do not bother the country's future, its economic dependence on external help as also perpetuation of its backwardness. So, will we not then throw away the future of industry and the goal of industrial development and self-reliance by selling ingots and semi-finished steel at subsidised rate to perpetuate stagnation and under development after decades of sufferings and sacrifices of the people?

Besides, another important aspect remains to be taken into consideration. I mean, the question of

up future policy on steel industry. The over-riding importance of expansion of home market cannot be brushed aside on any pretext. Here lies the solution, the goal and the very objective of industrial planning. The country, we have been told, has set before it this objective but the policy now being mooted just militates against this.

Having, therefore, set before us this basic approach we take up the particular points raised in questionnaire hereinafter.

1. None can contradict that expansion of steel industry is essential for the substantial growth and development of the economy as a whole because steel is the basic engineering raw material. Anybody having a mind for the country's uninterrupted industrial growth and development cannot but stand for the expansion of steel industry. It is a well-known fact that by country's development, we

Note of Comrade Pritish Chanda,

reliance? Can it be the short-sighted view of clearing the stock at a subsidised rate and thus causing a drain on the exchequer as we did last year? It is also an admitted fact that steel prices show a declining trend in the world market. This means that even the developed capitalist countries are also facing market problem. With a bid to retain or even expand market these countries are resorting to methods like undercutting to boost their sales. In the context of acute crisis in the capitalist world market, the competition between the capitalist countries has become very much sharp. And in this competition, the developed capitalist countries are trying to bring the developing coun-

increasing employment potential. It is one thing if the internal consumption of steel increases through development of newer industrial units. This brings more employment. But to be confined within the existing installed capacity of steel, and simply to export that portion of production which is not domestically absorbed, means no advancement in the matter of promotion of employment. This is corroborated by the fact that during the last two financial years, although there had been claim for increase in production there had been no increase in employment.

These are the basic questions that deserve utmost consideration in our opinion while framing

mean the all-round development of the vast masses of our country. In our opinion, vastness of population is not a dead-weight but is the biggest asset for a developing country. This requires modernisation and mechanisation of agriculture and uninterrupted development of industry. Having set agriculture as the base and industry as the leading factor, the government will have to take the responsibility of developing especially those industries that cater to the needs of people's consumption and improving standard of living. This also brings employment to the people.

Now what is the present position as regards steel production?

INGOT STEEL

Rated Capacity (Total of different plants excluding Bokaro)

8.9 M. tonnes

(Production as % of rated capacity)

'68-'69	70.9%	'69-'70	69.5%
'70-'71	66.2%	'71-'72	65.2%
'72-'73	68.9%	'73-'74	64.1%
'74-'75	69.0%	'75-'76	77.6%
'76-'77	§82.1%		

§ indicates Plan of production.

Policy on Steel Industry—

From the figures shown prepage it is relevant that production consistently remained below capacity, year after year. So, it would be obvious that the installed capacity which was fixed during 1967-68 has not yet been achieved even after ten years.

Some of the "over-enthusiastic experts" claim that the 'steel industry is not so sick now as some others think.' They have tried to establish that during 1976-77 in some plants the actual production has surpassed the rated capacity and they cite the case of Bhilai in favour of their claim and say that Bhilai has achieved 103% of the target. One may not entirely rule out the possibility of increase in volume of production at a particular plant in a given period of time due to diverse factors. Yet, a serious scrutiny of the data will reveal that even during 1976-77 the actual production which had been

generally means expansion of market for industry as a whole. For this, the purchasing power of the people must be increased and then and then only the demand for consumption would also increase, which in its turn, would create an urge for production and investment. But in our country where nearly 80% of total population are engaged in backward agrarian economy this can never be realised without bringing radical improvement in agrarian field including modernisation and mechanisation of agriculture. It is then only that various industries including ancillary and agro-based industries may develop providing employment to the rural people. If these tasks are fulfilled then only the standard of living of the common people will continuously improve with continuous increase in purchasing power leading to expansion of market for industries.

ore, manganese, chromite, kaynite etc. are being exported while we are talking about expansion of the industry. This should immediately be stopped.

So, this is a trend of some how getting foreign market to satisfy not the genuine aspirations of the people but to fulfil the immediate interest of state capitalism. It goes without saying that this will be to the serious detriment of the all-out development of the economy. It is, therefore, really amazing and far from reality that without any serious attempt being made for expansion of domestic market, which is an urgent necessity for industrial development, the 'experts' of the government have started talking that 'our home market is saturated' or 'there is limit to increase in domestic sale' and that 'we have become net exporter.' We are afraid, that even the developed countries have not yet made such claims

closely related to the question of development of general socio-cultural standard of the people. Besides, when the burning question in our country, today, is how to create employment opportunities to millions of unemployed, we can hardly import any such high technology that reduces employment avenues.

We are surely opposed to the tendency of blind imitation of the Western capitalist countries without having regard to its applicability in the particular condition of our country. Moreover, introduction of higher technology should not bring technological dependence as is the present trend in the capitalist world. The multinational corporations which usually monopolise high technology, are infiltrating into the economies of the relatively under-developed countries with a view to keeping these countries technologically-economically dependent. So, what can be really deterrent against this danger is the positive investment on research and encouragement to it by both the government in general and the steel industry in particular so as to meet the needs of the people at this stage of development with the technical skills that we possess and have scope for further development.

7. Question of Financing the expansion

The expansion of steel capacity should be wholly financed by domestic sources. We are strongly against taking loan in any form from the I.M.F., multinationals or from any foreign source. The domestic sources like unearthing black money, collection of evaded taxes or tax dues, forcing investment of bureaucratic capital etc. can be tapped, given the political will favours. The government can enter into state-to-state agreements but such agreements should be completely free from any political or economic string.

8. Whether Public or Private Sector or both

A basic industry like steel should be wholly in public sector and there

should be no deviation on any pretext.

9. Location of new Steel plants :

Location of new steel plants should not be on any narrow political, regional consideration. Nor should it satisfy any particular vested interest. It should be on techno-economic consideration having an eye to bringing balanced development of the country as a whole.

10. Steel Plants should be integrated steel plants.

16. Attitude of Employers to Industrial relations and workers' role for expansion of Steel Plants

It is the experience that the attitude of the management to the workers remain as before-bureaucratic and exploitative. Industrial relation in the public sector steel plants is no different from that of the private sectors. Employer-employee relation or master-servant relation governs both. Of course this has its root in the prevailing politico-socio-economic set up.

The burning problem of the workers, both economic and others, remain unheeded year after year. The anti-labour attitude of the management was further accentuated during the black days of Emergency. Steam-roller of repression and coercion was let loose in many a plant. Active trade union workers particularly belonging to unrecognised Unions were victimised, thrown out of jobs, increased work-loads were imposed upon them, proper and adequate manning were not done even when rightly demanded by the workers—all these are cited only as illustrations. The wrongs of the 'emergency-days' are not yet set right despite declaration from the new Janata Government.

In view of all these and particularly in a system where working class have no objective control over the total economy, it is absurd to expect of the workers playing any significant role in matters of policy-framing and in regard to expansion of steel industry.

(Contd. to Page 8)

General Secretary, UTUC (Lenin Sarani)

claimed to be 103% in comparison with the "Plan", is actually still below the level of installed capacity. Bhilai plant having an installed capacity of 2.5 million tonnes during 1976-77, the production plan was 2.25 million tonnes which was, no doubt, below the rated capacity and the actual production was 2.302 m.t. though this figure is higher than production plan, it is still short of the rated capacity which has been 2.5 m.t. Again, one should not forget, the said period was the black emergency period when by ruthless suppression, intimidation and coercion, workers were compelled to bear the increased work load through which there might have been a little increase in actual production. But this cannot be construed as an increase in growth rate.

2. This dismal picture calls for the urgent need of an all-out effort of expansion of domestic market. For, ever-expanding home market for steel

Naturally, therefore, what is needed is an integrated plan for development of industry as a whole for expansion of domestic market. So, when we talk of expansion of the steel industry at present, we should mean an integrated plan for expansion of home market as a pre condition to that.

Now, dealing with the question of export of steel it is admitted on all hands that export cannot be the substitute for the all-important necessity of expansion of domestic market. Besides, the question of export can come only when we have been able to meet the growing requirement of our society. We have not been able to reach the rated capacity set some ten years back. Moreover, foreign market can hardly provide an enduring solution in the context of stiff competition and uncertainties in the world capitalist market.

Another point needs be mentioned. Essential raw materials like iron

but with 14kg per capita (Government claimed figure) consumption of steel. We are claiming all this. How irresponsible is the attitude!

3, 4 & 5 : Yes, the existing plants should be expanded by raising the rated capacity. We oppose modernisation when it means rationalisation of labour forces tending to a reduction in employment potential. So, we want modernisation which is not only without tears of the workers but will create more employment avenues and improve both working and living conditions of the working class. We want new plants to be set up but they should be integrated steel plants.

6 & 13 : Introduction of new technology

The question of appropriate technology is always relative to overall need or requirement of the economy at a given point of time and phase of development of production.

Moreover, it is also very

(Contd. from Page 3)

the movement be saved from these trends and tendencies? That is why, if there is no ideological struggle within the mass movement, people will fight against the Congress but their struggles and sacrifices will go astray.

....So, you can very well see that Comrade Stalin has stressed again and again, on the imperative necessity of conduction of ideological struggles at different stages of co-ordinating legal with illegal activities both within the proletarian united front as also the united democratic front in order to defeat and isolate the social-democratic forces without which capitalism can not be overthrown.

For those who talk of fight against capitalism, Stalin has provided the important thesis: "It is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to social democracy." That is why, what he says is that—unless you, by conducting relentless and intense ideological struggle can disarm the different social democratic trends that lie hidden within the united mass movement to mislead and divert it at a crucial stage through compromise between labour and capital, and thus, unless you can free the working class and their movements from these social democratic trends of thinking, anti-capitalist revolution can not be victorious. And this is according to Stalin, the strategic aspect of the struggle against capitalism.

Those who can understand how different trends lie hidden within a movement can very well appreciate as to why our Party is so much insistent on conduction of ideological struggle within the united mass movements, why do we fight so much within it on questions of tactical line, principle and ideology. We do this not out of bias against anybody nor do we like to inject it.

—(Free translation from the speech of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh on the 57th Anniversary of November Revolution, 8th November, 1974.)

CPI(M) All Along Followed a Sectarian

History tells a different thing

Our party, led by our great departed leader and teacher, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, has always been guided by this revolutionary understanding about unity-struggle-unity and all through upheld this principle within the united left movement. We have shown, many times before in reply to CPI(M)'s canards that it is not our party but others mainly the CPI(M) have all along followed a sectarian, disruptive policy in pursuance of pragmatic bourgeois parliamentary politics and in support of this fact, we have cited concrete instances from history. It will be evident from this history that CPI(M) does not call the Forward Bloc disruptor although that party gave active political support both within and outside the Assembly to the Bangla Congress-Congress coalition ministry, along with CPI. And it is according to the own admission of CPI(M): "One of the main constituents of the front, the SUC has opposed the line of surrender to the Congress and has instead proposed a government of the ULF and ULDF".

—(People's Democracy, —4. 4. 71)

CPI(M) also does not call RSP a disruptor although that party, violating the unanimous decision of the leftist parties joined the rigged assembly of 1972. CPI(M) is also silent on its own disruptive left sectarian politics during the United Front governments, its opportunism on the 27th July bandh on the pretext of the so-called 'convergence' theory and other opportunist disruptive activities.

In fact, other than SUCI, with no other party, CPI(M) finds any difficulty to align at least on frontal basis. It has no difficulty to align with Janata Party, the principal bourgeois alternative today and about which CPI(M)'s own political assessment is that it represents the "same very vested interest" which Congress represents.

It would not have any difficulty to work in a coalition ministry under the Chief Ministership of Sri Prafulla Sen in West Bengal had Sri Sen and the State Janata Party agreed to the proposal of unity on 'minimum programme' proposed by CPI(M) and its associates before the assembly election. Similarly CPI(M) has no difficulty to have political alignment with the Akali, AIDMK, Kerala Congress, Muslim League—all the regional bourgeois and even communal parties. It even agrees to work with CPI on frontal level. But it has 'difficulty' to come to any united forum with SUCI and its mass organisations. Difficulty, why and what for? It does not spell out but always takes shelter under the false accusation of 'disruption' against a party to which socialism is a matter of serious conviction but not a convenient cover of any kind of opportunism.

CPI(M) leadership may have difficulty to spell out the real reason for their policy of 'no unity with SUCI' as they are using the so-called charge of

in class outlook and approach, a difference in base political line, between the capitalist roaders and revolutionary socialism, a difference between revolutionary Marxism and sham Marxism or social democracy. Therefore the struggle between the two lines is bound to appear in the sharp ideological-political struggle, which they dread most. That is why they set their term of unity by demanding of us renunciation of the right to ideological struggle. But they do not fear entering into debate, sometimes acrimonious ones, say with CPI, and other parties because those are in essence over the question of tactics in bourgeois parliamentarism or over the distribution of gains within bourgeois parliamentary politics. They do not disturb in the least, their basic political line and the class alignment behind it.

Where is the Difference

Now, we come to the question of 'difference' that exists between the present 'Left front' government and the previous UF governments which the

So, where can be the 'difference'? Difference can be in its very approach, attitude and style of functioning from those of the UF governments on such basic questions like, its handling of police and administration towards legitimate democratic mass movement including the militant forms of struggle like 'gherao', 'law and order' or bourgeois legality, democratic reforms along with the instruments for such reforms and finally its attitude to the bourgeoisie and the bureaucratic-administrative system. These are the cardinal issues where the present government's difference can occur and mark its distinct role in so far as toiling people's genuine interest is concerned.

'Police shall not interfere in the legitimate democratic movement'—is the cardinal point of difference between the UF and the Present government

Before analysing the 'difference' of the present government from the UF government we must know the basic difference of UF government from all

Disruptive policy for its Pragmatic Bourgeois Parliamentary Ends

disruption against our party, in the words of Lenin, as a "convenient screen to conceal petty-bourgeois conciliatory and nationalist-opposition striving (Lenin—The collapse of the Second International). The fact of the matter is that their difference with us is something qualitatively different from their difference with other parties. The difference that they have with other parties is as between different parliamentary election parties born out of rivalries in the matter of serving the same very bourgeois class and the same very capitalist productive system as also in the matter of enjoying the loaves and fishes of governmental power. But as we know, their difference with us is of a fundamental nature, a difference

CPI(M) leadership is reminding on and often as if to suggest that the present one is more progressive in so far as people's interest is concerned.

We would like to thank them, at the outset for giving admission to a fact which common people have long started feeling from bare experiences. Indeed, there is not only difference but a real difference, a lot of difference. But where lies the difference? It can not be in the character of the government because that does not alter by a mere change of government through ballot. So, the present government is as much 'an operator of capitalist state machine', 'a care-taker of the capitalist state' as were the previous UF governments.

other previous governments including the Nambudiripad Ministry in Kerala.

When the objective reality appeared after the 1967 election, to form a non-Congress ministry, for the first time in West Bengal, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, the great leader of the proletariat, set down the guide line as to what should be the attitude and approach of the revolutionaries while in a bourgeois care-taker government as also their style of functioning. This was his definite contribution to the revolutionary working class movement in as much as a clear-cut answer to this problem of our time can not be found in the Marxian classics.

Comrade Ghosh showed: ".....(with) the (Contd. to Page 7)

(Contd. from Page 6)
establishment of the United Front government....ample scope has also been created to control the bureaucracy and the police, foil the anti-people cliques and conspiracies of the privileged class to unleash a mighty wave of democratic movement...

"The question before us is should this government work as a faithful agent of this capitalist state as did the Congress Government or should we give the discontent of the people against capitalism the concrete shape of an organised movement? This is the real issue. These two roads are open before us now."

And for this, the first task of the UF, government would be, **Comrade Ghosh** indicated, to 'stop police interference in legitimate democratic movements, contrary to the practice during the Congress regime and control bureaucracy effectively.'

It was only on the acceptance of this basic approach to police and bureaucracy vis-a-vis democratic mass movement and the declaration by the UF, the policy of 'non-interference of police in legitimate mass movement' that our party entered the cabinet to take charge of the Labour portfolio and implement this principle in practice. The upswing in the working class movement was the direct outcome of this policy of our party and it at once marked the difference of the UF government from all other previous governments including the Nambudiripad Ministry in Kerala. This policy made the UF Government an instrument of mass struggles instead of being a servile tool of the bourgeoisie.

Now what is the attitude and approach of the present government? Are they anything different from those of the Congress Government?

On the very day of 'victory' celebration of the 'Left Front' on 27th June, the chief minister-designate Sri Jyoti Basu declared that although class differ-

ences and class conflicts are natural in capitalist society, they will see that "In the interest of West Bengal's economy" they "will seek to ensure that the conflicts do not intensify". The right to strike should be used by the workers as "the ultimate weapon" and hoped that "industrialists will see to it that the need to use that weapon does not arise". Obviously, this was an approach not of any encouragement but of positive discouragement to mass struggles and mass initiatives. Pursuant to this approach, this government has not reiterated in its policy declaration that "police shall not interfere in the legitimate democratic movement". Instead it says that the government shall not send police "to break movement". But at the same time at a conference of police officials, the chief minister has given

ing a movement but they were sent to do so on the ostensible plea of maintaining 'law and order'. In fact cases of police interference in legitimate trade union activities are on the increase and two specific instances of such interference against unions affiliated to UTUC (Lenin Sarani) have been brought to the notice of the chief minister, but to no result.

It is, therefore, clear that the police administration has made no mistake in reading the real intention of the government. It is behaving in the same manner to defend the 'law and order' as it was doing during the Congress Government. Bare experiences, therefore, prove that the present government shows its difference from the UF Government by making a clear departure on this fundamental question of approach and attitude in the matter of

people? Should it be by confining within the narrow bounds of bourgeois laws and concept of legality? Should it do it depending on the bureaucratic-administrative system? These questions arose when the UF Government was first installed in 1967.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh our great departed leader laid down the principles that: ".....It should be realised that in a capitalist society to depend on law and law alone will not deliver any good to the people. Because *whatever is legal is not necessarily justified moral and humanistic. It is more true in a capitalist society of the present day where order has become injustice.* On the basis of this outlook, the United Front Government will have to patronise the mass movements. **Comrade Ghosh** cautioned that

of "noninterference of police in legitimate democratic movement" and of this approach to mass movement, accepted by the UF constituents at our insistence, there was a great ferment in mass struggles and initiatives, during the UF Governments. 'Gherao' form of movement and recovery of benam lands by the peasants made the capitalists nervous and they were screaming that there was no 'law and order'! Giving a powerful rebuff, to this outcry of the monopolists, **Comrade Ghosh**, defended the policy and the mass initiative by holding:

"Tata says that 'gherao' is the law of the jungle.... If 'gherao' is the law of the jungle then the unfettered rights of the owners to retrench the workers, that is the 'law' that stands for the unfettered right of the owners to retrench without giving any protection for the right to work, is the law of the deepest jungle".

This policy, attitude and approach to bourgeois legality, mass struggles and bourgeois reforms enunciated by **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** the great leader of the proletariat brought a great hope and expectation to the people and a new surge in their struggles. This is the vital aspect from which they looked to the UF government as one entirely different from all other previous governments. The same policy, attitude and approach, they expected from the present government which calls itself left. But what do they find?

Let alone the question of 'gherao' form of movement which the government clearly disapproves and has already directed the police and district authorities to intervene to "avoid unnecessary inconvenience", the chief minister says that workers should resort to strike 'as the last weapon' and only then they will get the governments' support. He is urging the monopolists and the business community to be 'a little sympathetic' to the workers to treat them 'a little differently'.

Throwing to the four
(Contd. to Page 8)

"Police shall not Interfere in Legitimate Democratic Mass Movement" —Non-acceptance of this policy is the Cardinal Difference of the Present Government from the U.F.

them the 'guideline' that police will go to maintain "law and order". The material difference of this policy from that of the UF Government and no difference with that of the Congress or Janata Government both are clear. The working people of this state who have had their experience of the policy of the UF Government which was of direct help and encouragement to their movement expect that this government will follow the same. This government is also aware of this expectation of the toiling people. But instead of translating this expectation into concrete policy this government resorts to a ruse that as if it is following the same policy of the UF Government which is not a fact. Because, who does not know that even the Congress Government did not send police with the open declaration of break-

handling of police and administration towards mass movement and mass initiative. This is a departure even from consistent leftism, not to speak of other things.

Approach To Bourgeois Reforms & Bourgeois Legality

A government, even if it is of the leftists, elected within the bourgeois parliamentary system and the revolutionary overthrow of the very system are fundamentally different things. So, even for a leftist government it is impossible to bring about any solution to the basic problems of social life because of the very limitations of the capitalist system and of the bourgeois constitution of our country. The government can at best bring about certain reliefs to the people. But what should be its basic attitude and approach as also the method of bringing such reliefs to the

"...The government will fail to formulate correct policy towards mass movements, if it is not guided by this outlook. And in that case it will not be possible to acquire the land kept in possession by the jotedars in excess of the ceiling, under Benam transactions and distribute it to poor and landless peasants. But it is an imperative duty of the United Front Government to do so".

Providing guideline to the mass movement, **Comrade Ghosh** said: "In conducting mass movements it is necessary to have the outlook perfectly clear on certain points. *Every student of ethics and jurisprudence knows that what is legal may not be always justified and moral. Similarly everything illegal in the eye of law is not necessarily unjustified illegitimate and immoral.*"

Consequent on the declaration of the policy

Unity-Struggle-Unity—the only principle on which real unity can develop

(Contd. from Page 7)
winds the programme for confiscation of foreign capital and nationalisation of monopolies, contained in their Election Manifesto, the Chief Minister is assuring help to British owned Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation's scheme for expansion by saying "whether they are British or Indian, the fact is that they supply power. If they have a scheme why can't it be implemented?" (Economic Times 20.8.77) He is also inviting the monopoly houses and even the multinational corporations against which their party organ is so much vocal, by saying that, 'They are there, we can not wish them away. Therefore they might as well, invest here. We shall provide any help that may be necessary.....In return, we expect you to accept our reality and give us our opportunities for five years instead of conspiring against us'. —(Ibid)

On the question of peasant's initiative through Peoples' Committee as regards recovery of benam lands and their distribution, protection of the rights of the bargadars and agricultural workers, the 'left front' spokesmen are unanimous that 'the idea of the 'Gana Committee' (Peoples Committee) at different levels should not be encouraged'. (Statesman July 7, 77). The Land and Land Revenue Minister says to the Economic Times (July 8, 77) that the government has asked the police to safeguard the interest of the sharecroppers. The government will issue a guideline for the co-ordination of the BDO, JLRO and the OC for implementing land reforms with the help of the mass organisations of the constituent parties and also of those of CPI and the Congress or Janata Party.

The government is not raising its little fingers against lock-out, closure, lay offs. Prices are rising almost daily and have made people's life unbearable. People wonder why there is no organised

movement when the leftists are at the government. Not to speak of giving call for movement and taking side by the people, the government is not taking the steps within its power even, but washes its hands clean by pointing at the centre and appealing to the business community in the same manner the Janata Party is doing.

This government is therefore, very much different as it is not regarding itself as an 'instrument of struggle' of the masses which was the declared objective of the UF government. It has taken upon itself the responsibility to see that in the interest of 'West Bengal's economy', meaning the capitalist economy of West Bengal, class struggles and conflicts 'do not intensify'. For this, it has instructed the police and district authorities to intervene wherever gheraos is taking place 'to avoid unnecessary inconvenience' — inconvenience, surely not of the workers but of the capitalists. It is assuring the monopolists, the multinationals and the business community 'not to get nervous' because 'any help that may be necessary' will be given to them and in return the government be allowed to remain for the full term of five years. It cautions the workers that only in case they use strike as 'the last weapon' the government will support them. It urges the capitalists to be 'a little sympathetic' to the workers, to treat them 'a little differently' in return of this 'social peace'.

The rural vested interest is also feeling assured that there will be no peasant movement to recover benam lands, no mass pressure for rectification of the denial of legal right to the bargadars in Settlement Records, for their fair share in crops, for payment of wages at the government rate to the agricultural workers. The BDO, JLRO and OC's are quite familiar faces to the jotedars. They know very well how to deal

with them. Can the most imaginative mind bring out from all this any difference from a Congress government?

In sum and substance, the present government is spreading the illusion among the masses that if they can bear with the mounting capitalist exploitation which is manifesting in continuous price-spiralling, lock-out and closure of units, lay off, retrenchments of workers, destitution and eviction of peasants etc, without disturbing the law and order of the bourgeois system then the capitalists may be induced to invest more. If there is more investment then there will be more employment. Behind this fairy tale, they are hiding the fact that industrial unrest is not the cause of crisis in industry but it is the other way round. Capitalism is moribund today and is in the midst of third intense phase of general crisis when the relative stability of world capitalist market has totally disappeared. So, the capitalists are shy of investment not out of fear of workers unrest but due to crisis of market which in turn is due to low level of purchasing power of the people. No amount of coaxing the capitalists and dumb submission of the worker to their tyranny will alter this truth.

So, what we find about this government? The same unconditional and absolute faith in bourgeois law and legalism, the same concern for 'law and order' of the bourgeois system, the same apprehension about mass political initiative and struggles, the same dependence on the police and administration, the same eagerness to serve all sections of the people and to be in government for full term as any other bourgeois government or a bourgeois party will show. So, if it can be called a change—from left sectarian social-democratism to right social-democratic opportunism, a

Note of Comrade Prithvi Chanda

(Contd. from Page 5)

Additional Q. 3 & 4 :

Pollution has become, not only for the Western developed capitalist countries but also in our countries, a problem, may be in lesser magnitude. So the problem of pollution should not be ignored even at this stage of development

Steps are to be taken by the government to guard against both health hazards as also environmental changes. It is clear from the Approach Paper that some of the developed capitalist countries, including Japan are seeking to get rid of pollution problem by transferring plants to the developing countries. We must take guard against such move by any country.

Additional Q 4 :

All Papers in respect of expansion of steel plant etc. furnished by SAIL authority indicates the desire of some developed capitalist countries like Japan to exploit our scarce resources and labour power by investment of their finance capital and selling the products in the world to reap super profit. It goes without saying that this proposal, militates against the real objective of country's overall industrial development and 'Self-reliance'. However, information is also there that while the Study Group

change is no doubt there. But the question is how much 'left' is left with the 'left government'? How much apt is therefore Lenin's characterisation of the trend of social-chauvinism and opportunism when he pointed out long ago.

".....the theoretical victory of Marxism compelled its enemies to disguise themselves as Marxists. Liberalism, rotten within, tried to revive itself in the form of socialist opportunism. They interpreted the period of preparing the forces for great battles as renunciation of these battles. Improvement of the conditions of the slaves to fight against wage slavery, they took to mean, the sale by the slaves

has been entrusted by the Steel Ministry to work out the 'Guidelines' for the expansion of steel industry, the government has already advanced in its deal with Japan for adoption of this preposterous proposal, under cover of Joint-venture. What is then the purpose of this Study Group? Does the Steel Ministry want us to put the seal of approval to what it decides before hand?

PRICE RISE

(Contd. from Page 1)
between the previous government and the present one. But nothing short of all out state trading can bring some relief to the people. But the CPI(M) led government has not taken any concrete step in this direction. Or are they afraid of antagonising the big business people and monopoly houses by taking such measures? They are busy in assuring big business people and monopoly houses that they need not be afraid of a left government. Yet the measure we suggest has nothing to do with socialism but is a democratic measure taken in democratic countries. If the Government really wants to show a pro-people attitude it must introduce all out state trading of essential commodities ensuring their regular supply at standard quality to the people through an efficient distribution system. We would therefore call upon people to organise themselves, to raise this demand and build up a movement so as to compel the governments to introduce this measure which alone can bring some amount of relief to them even within the present system.

of their right to liberty for a few pence. They cravenly preached 'social peace' (i.e. peace with the slave-owner), renunciation of class struggle etc." —(Lenin, The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx—Italics ours.)

History is unfolding the truth. The 'difference' that they say is in the present government is not only due to the absence of the SUCI in it but for the absence of the revolutionary approach that was formulated by the great leader of the proletariat, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh which SUCI alone upheld and no other party dare uphold. This difference is the 'real difference' which no false cry will be able to hide.

Editor-in-Chief—NIHAR MUKHERJEE

Edited & Published by Sukomal Das Gupta from 48, Lenin Sarani and Printed by him at Ganadabi Printers & Publishers Private Limited, 52B, Indian Mirror Street, Calcutta-13.